

lavender as determined by the tests laid down in said Pharmacopœia official at the time of investigation, in that said Pharmacopœia requires that oil of lavender flowers should have a specific gravity of not less than 0.875 nor greater than 0.910 at 25° C., whereas the product had a specific gravity of 0.913 at 25° C., and contained esters of glycerin, and the real standard of strength, quality, and purity of the product was not stated on the bottle in which it was offered for sale.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statement "oil of lavender" borne on the label was false and misleading in that it created the impression that said product was a pure oil of lavender, when, in truth and in fact, it was oil of lavender containing esters of glycerin.

On May 13, 1913, the defendant company entered a plea of guilty to the information and the court imposed a fine of \$10 and costs.

B. T. GALLOWAY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 18, 1914.*

2901. Adulteration of frozen egg product. U. S. v. Isaac W. Bickley. Plea of non vult contendere. Fine, \$50 and costs. (F. & D. No. 4418. I. S. No. 1700-d.)

On June 18, 1913, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against Isaac W. Bickley, trading as A. F. Bickley & Son, a corporation, Philadelphia, Pa., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about November 27, 1911, from the State of Pennsylvania into the State of New Jersey, of a quantity of frozen egg product which was adulterated. The product was labeled on tags: "48." "F 34335. From Delaware Storage & Freezing Co. Cold Storage and Ice 402-410 N. N American Street. Sharp Freezing a specialty. Philadelphia, Pa."

Bacteriological examination of a sample of the product was made by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department with the following results: Organisms per gram on plain agar after 5 days: At 25° C., 130,000,000, 140,000,000, 70,000,000, 200,000,000, 90,000,000, 90,000,000; at 37° C., 30,000,000, 60,000,000, 30,000,000, 27,000,000, 130,000,000, 70,000,000; 100,000,000 *B. coli* group per gram; 10,000,000 streptococci per gram. These results show the sample to consist wholly or in part of a filthy, putrid, or decomposed animal substance. Adulteration of the product was alleged in the information for the reason that it consisted in part of a filthy, decomposed animal substance.

On June 18, 1913, the defendant entered a plea of non vult contendere to the information and the court imposed a fine of \$50 and costs of \$12.05.

B. T. GALLOWAY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 18, 1914.*

2902. Misbranding of port wine. U. S. v. A. Graf Distilling Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$5 and costs. (F. & D. No. 4423. I. S. No. 17303-d.)

On June 13, 1913, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Missouri, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against the A. Graf Distilling Co., a corporation, St. Louis, Mo., alleging shipment by said company in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about January 9, 1912, from the State of Missouri into the State of Illinois, of a quantity of port wine which was misbranded. The product was labeled: "10 Gals. Port Wine. Frank H. Meyer, Decatur, Illinois."

Analysis of a sample of the product by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed the following results:

Alcohol (per cent).....	19. 65
Solids (per cent).....	11. 92
Nonsugar solids (per cent).....	3. 11
Reducing sugars before inversion (per cent).....	8. 81
Polarization, direct, at 26°C (°V.)	5. 5

Invert, at 26°C (°V.)	5.8
Sucrose (Clerget)	None.
Ash (per cent)	0.32
Water-soluble ash (per cent)	0.26
Water-insoluble ash (per cent)	0.06
Alkalinity of soluble ash (cc N/10 acid per 100 grams)	0.22
Total tartrates (grams per 100 cc)	0.05
Total P ₂ O ₅ (mg per 100 grams)	50.2

Misbranding of the product was alleged in the information for the reason that the statements and words "Port Wine," so appearing on the label and upon the keg, were false and misleading because they misled and deceived the purchaser into the belief that the product was genuine port wine—that is to say, a product of Portugal—whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not a genuine port wine nor a product of Portugal, but was a domestic article and product; and was further misbranded in that it purported to be a foreign product, when it was not, and the words and statement "Port Wine," appearing on the label thereof, conveyed the impression that the product was a product of Portugal, when, in truth and in fact, it was a product of the United States.

On July 10, 1913, the defendant company entered a plea of guilty to the information and the court imposed a fine of \$5 and costs.

B. T. GALLOWAY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 18, 1914.*

2903. Adulteration and misbranding of turpentine. U. S. v. George J. Fox (Carolina Pine Products Co.). Plea of *nolo contendere*. Fine, \$25 and costs. (F. & D. No. 4432. I. S. No. 3479-d.)

On January 20, 1913, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Ohio, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court of the United States for said district an information against George J. Fox, trading as the Carolina Pine Products Co., Cleveland, Ohio, alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on or about November 18, 1911, from the State of Ohio into the State of Missouri, of a quantity of turpentine, which was adulterated and misbranded. The product was labeled: (On one end of barrel) "St. Louis Transfer Co., St. Louis, Mo. St. Louis Co. For % Carolina Pine Products Co., Gross 407, Tare 60." (Other end) "Carolina Pine Products Co., St. Louis. Turpentine. S. L. Not for medicinal use. The standard of quality and purity of the turpentine contained in this package is guaranteed and sold in accordance with the following chemical analysis: Specific gravity, 862 or 32½° B.; distillation percentage under 300° F., none; distillation percentage under 363° F., 80 to 90 per cent; percentage unpolymerizable, 25 to 35 per cent; flash point, 100° F. Warning: This label must be defaced or destroyed before this package is again used. Any disregard of this warning will be prosecuted to the full extent of the law. Carolina Pine Products Co."

Analysis of a sample of the product by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed the following results:

Unpolymerized oil (per cent)	29.6
Refractive index of oil at 20° C.	1.442
Mineral oil present (per cent) not less than	.30

Adulteration of the product was alleged in the information for the reason that it was sold under and by a name recognized in the United States Pharmacopœia official at the time of the investigation, and it differed from the standard of strength, quality, and purity as determined by the test laid down in said Pharmacopœia in that it contained a large proportion of mineral oil, and neither was its own standard of strength, quality, or purity plainly stated upon the container. Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statement on the label, "Turpentine," was false and misleading, as the product was not turpentine, but a mixture of turpentine and mineral oil.